

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-9, and 12-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner alleges that there is no support in the specification for the feature of a width of the droplets being smaller than that of the film pattern in the side of the first pattern forming area and the center of the second pattern forming area. Although Applicant does not necessarily agree with the Examiner, these features have been deleted from claims 1 and 7. Claims 12-13 are cancelled. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, therefore, is moot.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2 and 4-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Makoto Akahira, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,145,981). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 7 are amended and rewritten. Claims 1 and 7 now recite the feature of the droplets being formed entirely of the same material. In contrast to droplets being formed entirely of the same material, Akahira is directed to forming a

color filter. The droplets used to form the color filter, however, are not formed entirely of the same material because the color filter is formed to have different colors.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 7 recites the features of “a second step of arranging the droplets and forming a first area of a second film pattern at the same time as forming a second area of the first film pattern; and a third step of arranging the droplets and forming a second area of the second film pattern at the same time as forming a third area of the first film pattern, wherein...the droplets arranged in each of the first step, the second step, and the third step contact each other.” In contrast to arranging droplets at the same time and contacting each other, because the color filter has different colors, Applicant respectfully asserts that Akahiro fails to anticipate these features. In this regard, having the droplets contact each other and being arranged at the same time would result in intermixing thereof, which would result in intermixing of colors in the color filter. This, in turn, would cause degradation of display quality. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that Akahiro fails to anticipate claims 1, 7, and each corresponding dependent claim.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection, therefore, is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Makoto Akahira, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,145,981). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3 and 8 depend from claims 1 and 7, respectively, addressed above. These claims are neither anticipated nor obvious for at least the same reasons.

Claims 12-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Makoto Akahira, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,145,981) in view of Nakamura, et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0184613). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 12-13 are cancelled. This rejection, therefore, is moot.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Makoto Akahira, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,145,981) further in view of Nakamura, et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0184613) and Alfred I-Tsung Pan (U.S. Pat. No. 6,501,663). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 9 depends from claim 7, addressed above. Claim 9 is neither anticipated nor obvious for at least the same reasons.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and

favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 23, 2009

By: /G. Gregory Schivley/
G. Gregory Schivley, Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade, Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGG/BEW/JAH